

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the non-Final Office Action mailed on September 3, 2008 and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1 and 19 have been amended. Claims 29 and 30 have been previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. As result, claims 1-28 remain pending in the application.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 1-14 and 16-30

On pages 3-8 of the Final Office Action, claims 1-14 and 16-30 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,604,093 to Etzion et al. (Etzion) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,956,800 to Kametani and U.S. Patent No. 5,321,837 to Daniel et al. (Daniel) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,980,096 to Thalhammer-Reyero. Applicant submits that amended claims 1 and 19 obviate the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a system for notifying clients of job-related event instances. The system includes, among other things: a first trigger engine configured to register event requests, including a first event request from a first client and a second event request from a second client, and to combine the first event request and the second event request into a single base event request; and a second trigger engine configured to communicate with the first trigger engine to receive a registration of the single base event request at the second trigger engine, the first trigger engine further being configured to not communicate the first event request and the second event request to the second trigger engine in order to reduce a number of events to be remotely communicated, and the second trigger engine further being configured to receive a notification of an event instance corresponding to a base event occurring at an event source. Upon receipt of the notification of the event instance, the second trigger engine communicates data indicative of the event instance (corresponding to the base event) to the first trigger engine, the first trigger engine being configured to determine to which of the first event request and the second event request the event instance corresponds. The amendment to claim 1 is supported by the specification at page 4, lines 18-21.

Etzion fails to disclose a second trigger engine configured to communicate with a first trigger engine to receive a registration of a single base event request (combining the first event request and the second event request) at the second trigger engine, the first trigger engine being

configured to not communicate the first event request and the second event request to the second trigger engine in order to reduce a number of events to be remotely communicated, and the second trigger engine being further configured to receive notification of an event instance corresponding to a base event occurring at an event source, as required by claim 1.

Etzion discloses: specifying a composite event, which is a combination of two or more predefined component events; defining a rule, which causes a reaction to be invoked upon an occurrence of the composite event subject to a given condition; receiving at least first and second instances of the composite events before invoking the reaction; evaluating the first instance subject to the condition so as to determine whether the first instance can satisfy the rule, before evaluating the second instance; and responsive to evaluating the first instance subject to the condition, determining that the composite event has occurred and invoking the reaction. See col. 3, lines 24-37. However, Etzion fails to disclose that upon receipt of the notification of the event instance (corresponding to the base event), the second trigger engine communicates data indicative of the event instance to the first trigger engine, and the first trigger engine is configured to determine to which of the first event request and the second event request the event instance corresponds, wherein if the event instance corresponds to the first event request, then the first trigger engine notifies the first client (who registered the first event request) of the event instance, and if the event instance corresponds to the second event request, then the first trigger engine notifies the second client (who registered the second event request) of the event instance, as required by claim 1.

On pages 5 and 6 of the non-Final Office Action, the non-Final Office Action states that Kametani teaches outputting of combined data from a first processor to a second processor, which receives the registration of a single base event, and further communicates data back to the first processor.

Kametani relates to an arithmetic operation processing apparatus of a parallel arithmetic operating type, in which additional overhead associated with arithmetic operating processes can be reduced, overall arithmetic operation executing time can be reduced, and high processing speed can be realized (see Kametani at col. 3, lines 32-38). Even if Kametani teaches outputting combined data from a first processor to a second processor, which receives the registration of a single base event, and communicates data back to the first processor, as the non-Final Office Action at pages 5 and 6 alleges, and which Applicant neither admits nor confirms, Applicant

submits that Kametani fails to disclose or suggest, either separately or in combination with the other cited references, that upon receipt of a notification of an event instance (corresponding to a base event), the second trigger engine communicates data indicative of the event instance to the first trigger engine, the first trigger engine being configured to determine to which of the first event request and the second event request the event instance corresponds, wherein if the event instance corresponds to a first event request, then the first trigger engine notifies the first client (who registered the first event request) of the event instance, and if the event instance corresponds to a second event request, then the first trigger engine notifies a second client (who registered the second event request) of the event instance, as recited in amended claim 1.

Daniel relates to an event handling mechanism that categorizes events of a raw event stream into groups of events and associates an action or actions with each group of events (Daniel, at col. 1, lines 7-11). According to Daniel, events of an event stream or streams are filtered into categories or groups of events, and an action or actions are associated with the categorized groups of events (Daniel, col. 2, lines 12-18). Daniel discloses a parsing mechanism, which parses out select elements of each event included in a raw event stream to produce a standardized event, and a filtering mechanism, which applies selection criteria of filter table entries and applies the selection criteria to element types and values of the standardized event (Daniel, col. 2, lines 19-41). If a match is detected, an action mechanism is employed to determine an action to take for a matching group or event entry in an action table.

Applicant submits that Daniel is concerned with receiving multiple events, categorizing the events into groups and performing an action associated with a group to which a received event is categorized. Daniel is completely devoid of any disclosure or suggestion of a second trigger engine configured to communicate with a first trigger engine to receive a registration of a single base event request (which combines a first event request and a second event request) at the second trigger engine, the first trigger engine being configured to not communicate the first event request and the second event request to the second trigger engine in order to reduce a number of events to be remotely communicated, and a second trigger engine being further configured to receive notification of an event instance corresponding to a base event occurring at an event source, as required by claim 1. Daniel further fails to disclose that upon receipt of the notification of the event instance, the second trigger engine communicates data indicative of the event instance to the first trigger engine, the first trigger engine being configured to determine to

which of the first event request and the second event request the event instance corresponds, wherein if the event instance corresponds to the first event request, then the first trigger engine notifies the first client (who registered the first event request) of the event instance, and if the event instance corresponds to the second event request, then the first trigger engine notifies the second client (who registered the second event request) of the event instance.

Thalhammer-Reyero is directed to a computer-based interface, methods and systems for graphic information storage and retrieval, visual modeling and dynamic simulation of complex systems. See col. 4, lines 59-62. However, Thalhammer-Reyero fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Etzion, Kametani, and Daniel.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, Applicant submits that Etzion, Kametani, Daniel and Thalhammer-Reyero fail to disclose or suggest, either separately or in combination, all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Etzion in view of Kametani and Daniel and further in view of Thalhammer-Reyero and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-14 and 16-18 depend from claim 1, either directly or as a base claim. Applicant submits that claims 2-14 and 16-18 are patentable over Etzion in view of Kametani and Daniel and further in view of Thalhammer-Reyero for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 2-14 and 16-18 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 19 is directed to a method, in a computer network, for notifying clients of events. The method includes, among other things: combining, at a first trigger engine, a first event request and a second event request into a single base event request; registering, by the first trigger engine, the single base event request and not the first event request and the second event request at a second trigger engine of a remote server in order to reduce the number of events remotely communicated; receiving, by the first trigger engine from the second trigger engine, notification of an instance of a base event, the notification including event-specific information about the instance of the base event; analyzing, by the first trigger engine, event-specific information to determine to which of the first event request and the second event request the instance of the base event corresponds; notifying, by the first trigger engine the first client (from whom the first trigger engine received the first event request) if the event-specific information corresponds to the information specific to the first event request; and notifying, by

the first trigger engine, the second client (from whom these first trigger engine received the second event request) if the event-specific information corresponds to the information specific to the second event request.

Applicant submits that the above-mentioned features of amended claim 19 are similar to the previously-discussed features of amended claim 1. Applicant further submits that amended claim 19 is patentable over Etzion in view of Kametani and Daniel and further in view of Thalhammer-Reyero for reasons similar to those discussed with respect claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

Claims 20-28 depend from claim 19, either directly or as a base claim. Applicant submits that claims 20-28 are patentable over Etzion in view of Daniel for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 19. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 20-28 be withdrawn.

§ 103 Rejection of Claim 15

On page 9 of the non-Final Office Action, claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Etzion in view of Kametani, Daniel and Thalhammer-Reyero and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,485 to Baber et al. (Baber). Applicant submits that amended independent claim 1 obviates the rejection.

Claim 15 depends from claim 1, which is patentable over Etzion in view of Kametani, Daniel, and Thalhammer-Reyero for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicant submits that Baber fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Etzion, Kametani, Daniel, and Thalhammer-Reyero. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (888-703-1110, ext. 4) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500463.

Respectfully submitted,

By their Representatives,

Date April 28, 2009

By /Richard C. Irving/
Richard C. Irving
Reg. No. 38,499